arXiv:1105.3379v1 [math.NT] 17 May 2011

An algebraic result on the topological closure of the set of rational points on a sphere whose center is non-rational, II

By Jun-ichi Matsushita

Abstract

Let S be a sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $S \cap \mathbb{Q}^n \neq \emptyset$ and let Cl denote the closure operator in the Euclidean topology of $\mathbb{R}^n$. If the center of S is in $\mathbb{Q}^n$, then $\mathrm{Cl}(S \cap \mathbb{Q}^n)$ is S, as is easily proved. If the center of S is *not* in $\mathbb{Q}^n$, then what is $\mathrm{Cl}(S \cap \mathbb{Q}^n)$? This question, which was answered partially in the author's paper [Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **80** (2004), no. 7, 146–149], is answered completely in this paper by representing $\mathrm{Cl}(S \cap \mathbb{Q}^n)$ in terms of the group of $\mathbb{Q}$-automorphisms of the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n)$ in $\mathbb{C}$, where $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n$ denote the coordinates of the center of S.

1 Introduction.

Notation 1 Let Cl denote the closure operator in the Euclidean topology of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $|\cdot|$ (resp. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$) the standard Euclidean norm (resp. inner product) in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For each $x = (x_i)_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, let $\Re x$ (resp. $\Im x$) denote $(\Re x_i)_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}$ (resp. $(\Im x_i)_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}$), where $\Re x_i$ (resp. $\Im x_i$) denotes the real (resp. imaginary) part of x_i.

Let S be a sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $S \cap \mathbb{Q}^n \neq \emptyset$ and let us ask the following question:

$$\text{What is } \mathrm{Cl}(S \cap \mathbb{Q}^n)?$$

Our purpose is to answer this question, that is, to generalize the following easy-to-prove proposition to the case that the center of S is not necessarily in $\mathbb{Q}^n$.

Proposition 2 *If the center of S is in $\mathbb{Q}^n$, then*

$$\mathrm{Cl}(S \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) = S. \tag{1}$$

---

[0] 2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14G05; Secondary 14P25, 12F20, 15A99.

Key words and Phrases. sphere, rational point, topological closure, center, algebraic closure, automorphism group.

In Matsushita [3], we attained this purpose partially (see Remark 4). In this paper, we attain it completely. Let $\gamma = (\gamma_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}$ denote the center of S and let Ω be the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n)$ in $\mathbb{C}$ (note that γ is in Ω^n as well as in $\mathbb{R}^n$). Let Γ be the group of $\mathbb{Q}$-automorphisms of Ω and, for each $\sigma \in \Gamma$, let σ_* denote the map $\Omega^n \to \Omega^n$ given by $(x_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} \mapsto (\sigma(x_i))_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}$. Fix a point $b = (b_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} \in S \cap \mathbb{Q}^n$ and define, for each $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_a &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x-a| = |b-a|\} \\ &= \text{the sphere through } b \text{ with center } a, \\ \Lambda_a &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle a, x-b\rangle = 0\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \text{the hyperplane through } b \text{ with normal vector } a & \text{if} \quad a \neq 0 \\ \mathbb{R}^n & \text{if} \quad a = 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

(note that $S_\gamma = S$). Then the result of this paper is stated as follows:

Theorem 3 *We have*

$$\mathrm{Cl}(S \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (S_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)}). \tag{2}$$

Theorem 3 is certainly a generalization of Proposition 2 because if γ is in $\mathbb{Q}^n$, then $\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}(S_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)}) = S_{\Re\gamma} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\gamma} = S_\gamma \cap \Lambda_0 = S \cap \mathbb{R}^n = S$ and hence (2) coincides with (1). We prove Theorem 3 in the following sections.

Remark 4 The result of Matsushita [3] is a generalization (resp. specialization) of Proposition 2 (resp. Theorem 3) to the case that *the* $\mathbb{Q}$*-vector subspace of* $\mathbb{R}$ *spanned over* $\mathbb{Q}$ *by* $\gamma_1 - b_1, \ldots, \gamma_n - b_n$ *is a field that is Galois over* $\mathbb{Q}$.

2 Equivalent transformation of (2).

In this section, we equivalently transform (2). First we define, for each $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\Pi_a = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle a-b, x-b\rangle = 1\}.$$

Then we have

Proposition 5 *(2) is equivalent to*

$$\mathrm{Cl}(\Pi_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (\Pi_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)}). \tag{3}$$

Proof. As is easily verified, the inversion of $\mathbb{R}^n - \{b\}$ with respect to the sphere $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x-b| = \sqrt{2}\}$ (that is, the map

$$\mathbb{R}^n - \{b\} \to \mathbb{R}^n - \{b\}; \qquad x \mapsto b + \frac{2}{|x-b|^2}(x-b) \tag{4}$$

) is a (self-inverse) homeomorphism with respect to the Euclidean topology, and maps Π_a (resp. $\Lambda_a - \{b\}$) onto $S_a - \{b\}$ (resp. $\Lambda_a - \{b\}$) for each $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and maps $\mathbb{Q}^n - \{b\}$ onto $\mathbb{Q}^n - \{b\}$. Therefore, denoting it by φ, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3) \iff & \varphi(\mathrm{Cl}(\Pi_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n)) = \varphi\left(\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma}(\Pi_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)})\right) \\
\iff & \mathrm{Cl}(\varphi(\Pi_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n)) - \{b\} = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} \varphi(\Pi_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)}) \\
\iff & \mathrm{Cl}(S_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n - \{b\}) - \{b\} = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (S_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)} - \{b\}) \\
\iff & \mathrm{Cl}(S_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) - \{b\} = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (S_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)}) - \{b\} \\
\iff & \mathrm{Cl}(S_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (S_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)}),
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the proposition since $S_\gamma = S$. ■

Notation 6 From now on, we extend $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ to $\mathbb{C}^n$ by setting

$$\langle x, y\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i y_i$$

for any $x = (x_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}, y = (y_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$ (note that we have

$$\langle \sigma_*(x), \sigma_*(y)\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma(x_i)\sigma(y_i) = \sigma(\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i y_i) = \sigma(\langle x, y\rangle)$$

for any $x = (x_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}, y = (y_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}$ in Ω^n and any $\sigma \in \Gamma$).

Next we define, for each $a \in \Omega^n$,

$$\Theta_a = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : \forall\sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \langle \sigma_*(a) - b, x - b\rangle = 1\}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n &= \{x \in \mathbb{Q}^n : \forall\sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \langle \sigma_*(\gamma) - b, x - b\rangle = 1\} \\
&= \{x \in \mathbb{Q}^n : \forall\sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \langle \sigma_*(\gamma - b), \sigma_*(x - b)\rangle = 1\} \\
&= \{x \in \mathbb{Q}^n : \forall\sigma \in \Gamma \ \sigma(\langle \gamma - b, x - b\rangle) = 1\} \\
&= \{x \in \mathbb{Q}^n : \langle \gamma - b, x - b\rangle = 1\} \\
&= \Pi_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n, \\
\Theta_\gamma \cap \mathbb{R}^n &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \forall\sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \langle \sigma_*(\gamma) - b, x - b\rangle = 1\} \\
&= \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \forall\sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \left\langle \Re\sigma_*(\gamma) + \sqrt{-1}\Im\sigma_*(\gamma) - b, x - b\right\rangle = 1\right\} \\
&= \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \forall\sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \langle \Re\sigma_*(\gamma) - b, x - b\rangle + \sqrt{-1}\,\langle \Im\sigma_*(\gamma), x - b\rangle = 1\right\} \\
&= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \forall\sigma \in \Gamma \ (\langle \Re\sigma_*(\gamma) - b, x - b\rangle = 1, \ \ \langle \Im\sigma_*(\gamma), x - b\rangle = 0)\} \\
&= \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (\Pi_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)})
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

Proposition 7 *(3) is equivalent to*

$$\mathrm{Cl}(\Theta_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) = \Theta_\gamma \cap \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{5}$$

By Proposition 5 and Proposition 7, we have that (2) is equivalent to (5).

3 Rationality for affine subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Notation 8 In this section and the next section, we use the following notation:

(a) For any field F and any subset M of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, F^M denotes the set of families of elements of F indexed by M (regarded as a F-vector space by defining addition and scalar multiplication as $\{x_i\}_{i\in M} + \{x'_i\}_{i\in M} = \{x_i + x'_i\}_{i\in M}$ and $c\{x_i\}_{i\in M} = \{cx_i\}_{i\in M}$).

(b) For any subset M of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, P_M denotes the linear surjection $\mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^M$ given by $(x_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} \mapsto \{x_i\}_{i\in M}$.

Let U be a non-empty affine subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let K be a subfield of $\mathbb{C}$. In this section, we introduce the notion of *rationality* of U over K, which plays important roles in the next section. First we define three terms on U.

Definition 9 For any $\beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$U = \beta_0 + (\mathbb{C}\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{C}\beta_m),$$

$(\beta_0; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m)$ is called a *frame* for U.

Definition 10 A system of linear equations in $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}$ is called a *defining system* for U if it is a necessary and sufficient condition for $(x_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ to be in U, that is, if U is the set of $(x_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfying it (note that, since U is non-empty, any defining system for U is consistent).

Definition 11 A pair (M, f) of a subset M of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and an affine map $f : \mathbb{C}^M \to \mathbb{C}^{M^c}$ is called a *defining pair* for U if

$$P_{M^c}(x) = f(P_M(x))$$

is a necessary and sufficient condition for $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ to be in U, that is, if

$$\{x_i\}_{i\in M^c} = f(\{x_i\}_{i\in M}) \tag{6}$$

is a defining system for U.

Remark 12 As is clear from elementary linear algebra, there exists a defining system for U in reduced echelon form, which, when solved for the leading variables in terms of the free variables, can be written as (6) for some subset M of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and some affine map $f : \mathbb{C}^M \to \mathbb{C}^{M^c}$. Therefore there exist a subset M of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and an affine map $f : \mathbb{C}^M \to \mathbb{C}^{M^c}$ such that (6) is a defining system for U, that is, there exists a defining pair for U.

Next we note that $U \cap K^n$ is clearly an affine subspace of K^n and prove two lemmas.

Lemma 13 *Let* $(\beta_0; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ *be a frame for* U*. Then we have*

$$\beta_0, \dots, \beta_m \in K^n \implies U \cap K^n = \beta_0 + (K\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus K\beta_m).$$

Proof. Since

$$\beta_0, \dots, \beta_m \in K^n \implies U \cap K^n \supset \beta_0 + (K\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus K\beta_m)$$

is clear, we need only show

$$\beta_0, \dots, \beta_m \in K^n \implies U \cap K^n \subset \beta_0 + (K\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus K\beta_m).$$

This holds because, letting p be a K-linear projection from the K-vector space $\mathbb{C}$ onto its subspace K and defining the map $p_* : \mathbb{C}^n \to K^n$ by $p_*((x_i)_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}) = (p(x_i))_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0, \dots, \beta_m \in K^n \implies p_*(U) &= p_*(\beta_0 + (\mathbb{C}\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{C}\beta_m)) \\ &= p_*(\beta_0) + (p(\mathbb{C})\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus p(\mathbb{C})\beta_m) \\ &= \beta_0 + (K\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus K\beta_m) \end{aligned}$$

and $U \cap K^n = p_*(U \cap K^n) \subset p_*(U)$. ■

Lemma 14 *Let* (M, f) *be a defining pair for* U*. Then the following hold:*
(a) U *is isomorphic to* $\mathbb{C}^M$*.*
(b) $U \cap K^n$ *is isomorphic to the affine subspace* $K^M \cap f^{-1}(K^{M^c})$ *of* K^M*.*

Proof. Since any $x \in K^n$ satisfies $P_M(x) \in K^M$ and any $x, x' \in U$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} x = x' &\iff (P_M(x) = P_M(x'),\ P_{M^c}(x) = P_{M^c}(x')) \\ &\iff (P_M(x) = P_M(x'),\ f(P_M(x)) = f(P_M(x'))) \\ &\iff P_M(x) = P_M(x'), \end{aligned}$$

P_M gives a one-to-one map $U \cap K^n \to K^M$. This map is clearly affine, and its image is $K^M \cap f^{-1}(K^{M^c})$ because

$$\begin{aligned} & P_M(U \cap K^n) \\ &= P_M(\{x \in K^n : P_{M^c}(x) = f(P_M(x))\}) \\ &= P_M(\{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : P_M(x) \in K^M,\ P_{M^c}(x) \in K^{M^c},\ P_{M^c}(x) = f(P_M(x))\}) \\ &= P_M(\{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : P_M(x) \in K^M,\ f(P_M(x)) \in K^{M^c},\ P_{M^c}(x) = f(P_M(x))\}) \\ &= \{y \in \mathbb{C}^M : y \in K^M,\ f(y) \in K^{M^c}\} \\ &= K^M \cap f^{-1}(K^{M^c}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore there exists a one-to-one affine map $U \cap K^n \to K^M$ whose image is $K^M \cap f^{-1}(K^{M^c})$, that is, (b) holds. (a) is the case $K = \mathbb{C}$ of (b). ■

Under these preparations, we prove a proposition and define the notion of *rationality* of U over K.

Proposition 15 *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *There exists a frame* $(\beta_0; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ *for* U *satisfying* $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_m \in K^n$.

(b) *There exists a defining system for* U *with coefficients in* K.

(c) *There exists a defining pair* (M, f) *for* U *satisfying* $f(K^M) \subset K^{M^c}$.

(d) *Every defining pair* (M, f) *for* U *satisfies* $f(K^M) \subset K^{M^c}$.

Proof. We prove this by showing the equivalence of (a), (b), (c), (d), and

$$\dim_K(U \cap K^n) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} U. \tag{7}$$

(d) $\Longrightarrow$ (c): This is clear since, as was shown in Remark 12, there exists a defining pair for U.

(c) $\Longrightarrow$ (b): This holds because, as is easily seen, every defining pair (M, f) for U satisfies that if $f(K^M) \subset K^{M^c}$, then (6) is a defining system for U with coefficients in K.

(b) $\Longrightarrow$ (a): This is readily seen from the faithfully flatness of $\mathbb{C}$ over K.

(a) $\Longrightarrow$ (7): This holds because, by Lemma 13, every frame $(\beta_0; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ for U satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_0, \dots, \beta_m \in K^n \implies \dim_K(U \cap K^n) &= \dim_K(\beta_0 + (K\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus K\beta_m)) \\ &= \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\beta_0 + (\mathbb{C}\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{C}\beta_m)) \\ &= \dim_{\mathbb{C}} U.\end{aligned}$$

(7) $\Longrightarrow$ (d): This holds because, by Lemma 14, every defining pair (M, f) for U satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}(7) &\iff \dim_K(K^M \cap f^{-1}(K^{M^c})) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^M \\ &\iff \dim_K(K^M \cap f^{-1}(K^{M^c})) = \dim_K K^M \\ &\iff K^M \cap f^{-1}(K^{M^c}) = K^M \\ &\iff K^M \subset f^{-1}(K^{M^c}) \\ &\iff f(K^M) \subset K^{M^c}.\end{aligned}$$

■

Definition 16 U is said to be *rational* over K if the equivalent conditions of Proposition 15 hold (compare this with Bourbaki [1, p. 318, Definition 2]).

4 Proof of (5).

Notation 17 In this section, we use the following notation:

(a) For any subset M of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, I_M denotes the bijection $\mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^M \times \mathbb{C}^{M^c}$ given by $(x_i)_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \mapsto (\{x_i\}_{i \in M}, \{x_i\}_{i \in M^c})$, that is, $x \mapsto (P_M(x), P_{M^c}(x))$.

(b) For any $\tau \in \Gamma$ and any subset M of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, τ_M denotes the bijection $\Omega^M \to \Omega^M$ given by $\{x_i\}_{i \in M} \mapsto \{\tau(x_i)\}_{i \in M}$.

(c) For any $\tau \in \Gamma$ and any subset M of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, τ_M^{-1} denotes $(\tau_M)^{-1}$, that is, $(\tau^{-1})_M$.

(d) For any $\tau \in \Gamma$, τ_*^{-1} denotes $(\tau_*)^{-1}$, that is, $(\tau^{-1})_*$.

In this section, we complete our proof of Theorem 3 by proving that (5), which was shown to be equivalent to (2) in Section 2, holds. Since the case $\Theta_\gamma = \emptyset$ is trivial, we restrict ourselves to the case $\Theta_\gamma \neq \emptyset$, in which Θ_γ is (since it is clearly an affine subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$) a non-empty affine subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$, that is, an example of U. First we prove two lemmas.

Lemma 18 *If U is rational over Ω, every defining pair (M, f) for U satisfies*

$$I_M(\tau_*(U \cap \Omega^n)) = \left\{ \left(y, \tau_{M^c}(f(\tau_M^{-1}(y)))\right) : y \in \Omega^M \right\} \tag{8}$$

for every $\tau \in \Gamma$.

Proof. For every $\tau \in \Gamma$, every defining pair (M, f) for U satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&I_M(\tau_*(U \cap \Omega^n)) \\
&= I_M(\tau_*(\{x \in \Omega^n : P_{M^c}(x) = f(P_M(x))\})) \\
&= I_M(\{x \in \Omega^n : P_{M^c}(\tau_*^{-1}(x)) = f(P_M(\tau_*^{-1}(x)))\}) \\
&= I_M(\{x \in \Omega^n : \tau_{M^c}^{-1}(P_{M^c}(x)) = f(\tau_M^{-1}(P_M(x)))\}) \\
&= I_M(\{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : P_M(x) \in \Omega^M,\ P_{M^c}(x) \in \Omega^{M^c},\ \tau_{M^c}^{-1}(P_{M^c}(x)) = f(\tau_M^{-1}(P_M(x)))\}) \\
&= \{(y, z) \in \mathbb{C}^M \times \mathbb{C}^{M^c} : y \in \Omega^M,\ z \in \Omega^{M^c},\ \tau_{M^c}^{-1}(z) = f(\tau_M^{-1}(y))\} \\
&= \{(y, z) \in \mathbb{C}^M \times \mathbb{C}^{M^c} : y \in \Omega^M,\ f(\tau_M^{-1}(y)) \in \Omega^{M^c},\ z = \tau_{M^c}(f(\tau_M^{-1}(y)))\} \\
&= \left\{ \left(y, \tau_{M^c}(f(\tau_M^{-1}(y)))\right) : y \in \Omega^M,\ f(\tau_M^{-1}(y)) \in \Omega^{M^c} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
(8) &\iff \forall y \in \Omega^M \quad f(\tau_M^{-1}(y)) \in \Omega^{M^c} \\
&\iff \forall y \in \tau_M^{-1}(\Omega^M) \quad f(y) \in \Omega^{M^c} \\
&\iff \forall y \in \Omega^M \quad f(y) \in \Omega^{M^c} \quad (\because \tau_M^{-1}(\Omega^M) = \Omega^M) \\
&\iff f(\Omega^M) \subset \Omega^{M^c}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore every defining pair (M, f) for U satisfies (8) for every $\tau \in \Gamma$ if every defining pair (M, f) for U satisfies $f(\Omega^M) \subset \Omega^{M^c}$, that is, if U is rational over Ω. ■

Lemma 19 *The set of invariants of Γ is equal to $\mathbb{Q}$.*

Proof. By Bourbaki [2, Chapter V, p. 112, Proposition 10], the set of invariants of the group of $\mathbb{Q}$-automorphisms of any algebraically closed extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ is equal to $\mathbb{Q}$. Since Ω, of which Γ is the group of $\mathbb{Q}$-automorphisms, is an algebraically closed extension of $\mathbb{Q}$, this implies the lemma. ■

Using Lemma 13 and these two lemmas, we prove

Proposition 20 *If U is rational over Ω and*

$$\forall \tau \in \Gamma \quad \tau_*(U \cap \Omega^n) = U \cap \Omega^n, \tag{9}$$

then

$$\mathrm{Cl}(U \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) = U \cap \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{10}$$

Proof. We prove this by showing that

$$(10) \text{ holds if } U \text{ is rational over } \mathbb{Q} \tag{11}$$

and that

$$U \text{ is rational over } \mathbb{Q} \text{ if } U \text{ is rational over } \Omega \text{ and (9) holds.} \tag{12}$$

(11) is shown as follows: By Lemma 13, every frame $(\beta_0; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m)$ for U satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{Q}^n &\implies U \cap \mathbb{Q}^n = \beta_0 + (\mathbb{Q}\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Q}\beta_m), \\ \beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}^n &\implies U \cap \mathbb{R}^n = \beta_0 + (\mathbb{R}\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{R}\beta_m) \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{Q}^n \implies \mathrm{Cl}(U \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) &= \mathrm{Cl}(\beta_0 + (\mathbb{Q}\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Q}\beta_m)) \\ &= \beta_0 + (\mathbb{R}\beta_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{R}\beta_m) \\ &= U \cap \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (10) holds if there exists a frame $(\beta_0; \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m)$ for U satisfying $\beta_0, \ldots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{Q}^n$, that is, if U is rational over $\mathbb{Q}$.

(12) is shown as follows: If U is rational over Ω, then, by Lemma 18, every defining pair (M, f) for U satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (9) &\iff \forall \tau \in \Gamma \ \ I_M(\tau_*(U \cap \Omega^n)) = I_M(U \cap \Omega^n) \\ &\iff \forall \tau \in \Gamma \ \ \left\{ \left(y, \tau_{M^c}(f(\tau_M^{-1}(y)))\right) : y \in \Omega^M \right\} = \{(y, f(y)) : y \in \Omega^M\} \\ &\iff \forall \tau \in \Gamma \ \ \forall y \in \Omega^M \ \ \tau_{M^c}(f(\tau_M^{-1}(y))) = f(y) \\ &\implies \forall \tau \in \Gamma \ \ \forall y \in \mathbb{Q}^M \ \ \tau_{M^c}(f(\tau_M^{-1}(y))) = f(y) \\ &\iff \forall \tau \in \Gamma \ \ \forall y \in \mathbb{Q}^M \ \ \tau_{M^c}(f(y)) = f(y) \\ &\iff \forall y \in \mathbb{Q}^M \ \ f(y) \in \mathbb{Q}^{M^c} \quad \text{(by Lemma 19)} \\ &\iff f(\mathbb{Q}^M) \subset \mathbb{Q}^{M^c}. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Therefore if U is rational over Ω and (9) holds, then every defining pair (M, f) for U satisfies $f(\mathbb{Q}^M) \subset \mathbb{Q}^{M^c}$, that is, U is rational over $\mathbb{Q}$. ■

Remark 21 Noting that f is an affine map and using the obvious fact that *each element of* Ω^M *can be written as an affine combination (over* Ω*) of elements of* $\mathbb{Q}^M$, we can easily justify replacing '$\implies$' in (13) by '$\iff$', which changes the first sentence of the proof of (12) to imply not only that *if* U *is rational over* Ω *and (9) holds, then every defining pair* (M, f) *for* U *satisfies* $f(\mathbb{Q}^M) \subset \mathbb{Q}^{M^c}$*, that is,* U *is rational over* $\mathbb{Q}$ but also that *if* U *is rational over* Ω*, then (9) holds if there exists a defining pair* (M, f) *for* U *satisfying* $f(\mathbb{Q}^M) \subset \mathbb{Q}^{M^c}$*, that is, if* U *is rational over* $\mathbb{Q}$, which and the obvious fact that U *is rational over* Ω *if* U *is rational over* $\mathbb{Q}$ imply the converse of (12). Hence we have not only (12) but also its converse, that is, U *is rational over* $\mathbb{Q}$ *if and only if* U *is rational over* Ω *and (9) holds* (compare this with Bourbaki [1, p. 324, Theorem 1 (i)]).

Now we prove that $U = \Theta_\gamma$ satisfies the rationality of U over Ω and (9), that is, the following holds, which, by Proposition 20, implies that $U = \Theta_\gamma$ satisfies (10), that is, (5) holds.

Proposition 22 Θ_γ *is rational over* Ω *and*

$$\forall \tau \in \Gamma \quad \tau_*(\Theta_\gamma \cap \Omega^n) = \Theta_\gamma \cap \Omega^n. \tag{14}$$

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta_\gamma &= \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : \forall \sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \langle \sigma_*(\gamma) - b, x - b\rangle = 1\} \\
&= \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : \forall \sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \langle \sigma_*(\gamma) - b, x\rangle = 1 + \langle \sigma_*(\gamma) - b, b\rangle\} \\
&= \left\{(x_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} \in \mathbb{C}^n : \forall \sigma \in \Gamma \ \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\sigma(\gamma_i) - b_i)x_i = 1 + \langle \sigma_*(\gamma) - b, b\rangle\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

a defining system for Θ_γ is

$$\forall \sigma \in \Gamma \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\sigma(\gamma_i) - b_i)x_i = 1 + \langle \sigma_*(\gamma) - b, b\rangle\,,$$

which is with coefficients in Ω. Hence there exists a defining system for Θ_γ with coefficients in Ω, that is, Θ_γ is rational over Ω. (14) holds because

$$\begin{aligned}
\forall \tau \in \Gamma \ \ \tau_*(\Theta_\gamma \cap \Omega^n) &= \tau_*(\{x \in \Omega^n : \forall \sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \langle \sigma_*(\gamma) - b, x - b\rangle = 1\}) \\
&= \left\{x \in \Omega^n : \forall \sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \left\langle \sigma_*(\gamma) - b, \tau_*^{-1}(x) - b\right\rangle = 1\right\} \\
&= \left\{x \in \Omega^n : \forall \sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \left\langle \tau_*^{-1}((\tau\sigma)_*(\gamma) - b), \tau_*^{-1}(x - b)\right\rangle = 1\right\} \\
&= \{x \in \Omega^n : \forall \sigma \in \Gamma \ \tau^{-1}(\langle (\tau\sigma)_*(\gamma) - b, x - b\rangle) = 1\} \\
&= \{x \in \Omega^n : \forall \sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \langle (\tau\sigma)_*(\gamma) - b, x - b\rangle = 1\} \\
&= \{x \in \Omega^n : \forall \sigma \in \tau\Gamma \ \ \langle \sigma_*(\gamma) - b, x - b\rangle = 1\} \\
&= \{x \in \Omega^n : \forall \sigma \in \Gamma \ \ \langle \sigma_*(\gamma) - b, x - b\rangle = 1\} \quad (\because \tau\Gamma = \Gamma) \\
&= \Theta_\gamma \cap \Omega^n.
\end{aligned}$$

■

Remark 23 Let $a = (a_i)_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}$ be an element of Ω^n. Then, replacing γ (resp. γ_i) by a (resp. a_i) everywhere in our proof of (5), we obtain

$$\mathrm{Cl}(\Theta_a \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) = \Theta_a \cap \mathbb{R}^n,$$

which, by modifying the proof of Proposition 7, is shown to be equivalent to

$$\mathrm{Cl}(\Pi_{\Re a} \cap \Lambda_{\Im a} \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (\Pi_{\Re\sigma_*(a)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(a)}),$$

which, by modifying the proof of Proposition 5, is shown to be equivalent to

$$\mathrm{Cl}(S_{\Re a} \cap \Lambda_{\Im a} \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (S_{\Re\sigma_*(a)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(a)}).$$

(2) is the case $a = \gamma$ of this last formula.

Remark 24 Let q be a non-degenerate definite quadratic form $\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $q(\mathbb{Q}^n) \subset \mathbb{Q}$, and B the polar form of q, that is, the symmetric bilinear form $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ that is defined by $B(x,y) \equiv \frac{1}{2}(q(x+y)-q(x)-q(y))$ (and hence satisfies $B(x,x) \equiv q(x)$), and L the linear map $\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $B(x,y) \equiv \langle L(x), y\rangle$ (note that an example of q is $q(x) \equiv |x|^2$, which implies $B(x,y) \equiv \langle x,y\rangle$ and hence $L(x) \equiv x$). Then, as is easily proved, the map

$$\mathbb{R}^n - \{b\} \to \mathbb{R}^n - \{b\}; \qquad x \mapsto b + \frac{2}{q(L^{-1}(x-b))} L^{-1}(x-b) \tag{15}$$

is well-defined, and is a homeomorphism with respect to the Euclidean topology (with the inverse $x \mapsto b + \frac{2}{q(x-b)} L(x-b)$), and maps Π_a (resp. $\Lambda_a - \{b\}$) onto

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n - \{b\} : q\,(x-a) = q\,(b-a)\} \text{ (resp. } \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n - \{b\} : B(a, x-b) = 0\}) \tag{16}$$

for each $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and maps $\mathbb{Q}^n - \{b\}$ onto $\mathbb{Q}^n - \{b\}$ (note that if $q(x) \equiv |x|^2$ and hence $B(x,y) \equiv \langle x,y\rangle$, $L(x) \equiv x$, then (15) coincides with (4) and (16) coincides with $S_a - \{b\}$ (resp. $\Lambda_a - \{b\}$) for each $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$). Therefore, denoting it by φ' and denoting

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : q\,(x-a) = q\,(b-a)\} \text{ (resp. } \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : B(a, x-b) = 0\})$$

by S'_a (resp. Λ'_a) for each $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3) \iff & \varphi'(\mathrm{Cl}(\Pi_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n)) = \varphi'\left(\bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (\Pi_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)})\right) \\
\iff & \mathrm{Cl}(\varphi'(\Pi_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n)) - \{b\} = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} \varphi'(\Pi_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)}) \\
\iff & \mathrm{Cl}(S'_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n - \{b\}) - \{b\} = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (S'_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda'_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)} - \{b\}) \\
\iff & \mathrm{Cl}(S'_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) - \{b\} = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (S'_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda'_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)}) - \{b\} \\
\iff & \mathrm{Cl}(S'_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (S'_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda'_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)}),
\end{aligned}$$

which and Proposition 7 and the fact that (5) holds imply that

$$\mathrm{Cl}(S'_\gamma \cap \mathbb{Q}^n) = \bigcap_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (S'_{\Re\sigma_*(\gamma)} \cap \Lambda'_{\Im\sigma_*(\gamma)})$$

holds. (2) is the case $q(x) \equiv |x|^2$ of this formula.

Remark 25 The entire paper remains valid if we replace "let Ω be the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n)$ in $\mathbb{C}$" by "let Ω be an algebraically closed subfield of $\mathbb{C}$ containing $\mathbb{Q}(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n)$".

Remark 26 Let k be a subfield of $\mathbb{R}$. Then the entire paper remains valid if we replace $\mathbb{Q}$ by k everywhere.

References

[1] N. Bourbaki, Elements of Mathematics, Algebra I, Chapters 1–3, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1998 (Reprint of the 1989 English translation).

[2] N. Bourbaki, Elements of Mathematics, Algebra II, Chapters 4–7, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 2003 (Reprint of the 1990 English edition).

[3] J. Matsushita, An algebraic result on the topological closure of the set of rational points on a sphere whose center is non-rational, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci., **80** (2004), no. 7, 146–149.

Jun-ichi Matsushita
Contact address: 6-5-15, Higashiogu, Arakawa-ku, Tokyo 116-0012, Japan
E-mail: j-matsu@pk.highway.ne.jp